

while investing more in our future is to continue the process of making tough and specific policy choices. If we avoid such straight-forward debate now, the likely outcome will be accounting subterfuge and gimmicks when the easy promise of a balanced budget amendment runs up against difficult political realities. A gridlocked Congress would encourage members to look for an easy way out—for example, by moving more Federal programs off budget or by imposing more unfunded mandates on the States. Ironically, the amendment might encourage less rather than more fiscal responsibility.

The amendment's potential impact on our constitutional system is as troublesome as its effect on the economy. The proposed amendments are so vague and complex that budgets quickly could be thrown into the courts to be written by appointed judges with life tenure, rather than the people's elected officials in the Congress. Surely, we can do better than this.

Finally, I believe that economic and budgetary decisions should distinguish between investment and consumption. Those who manage a family budget know that there is a fundamental difference between spending money on a lavish meal, and paying the mortgage on a home that is an investment in one's future economic security. Under this balanced budget amendment, there is no distinction between cutting a dollar in waste and a dollar in a valuable investment in technology that could make us a richer and more competitive Nation in the future. That is unacceptable to me. We need to find ways to reduce the deficit and increase investment in ways that enhance not undermine the economic security and potential of our people and their communities. We must bring down the budget deficit at the same time we make progress on bringing down the investment deficit through investments in those who helped us win the cold war, through more resources to fight drugs and crime, and by giving all Americans the opportunity for quality education and training throughout their lifetimes.

I remain firmly committed to the goal of deficit reduction. But I am just as firmly opposed to this balanced budget amendment, because it would simply delay honest debate

over the hard choices needed for long-term economic growth and could imperil the economic stability of the Nation and our fledgling recovery.

Sincerely,

**Bill Clinton**

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and George J. Mitchell, Senate majority leader. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

## **Appointments to Senior Executive Service Posts**

*November 5, 1993*

The President today named 22 men and women to Senior Executive Service positions in a number of Federal Agencies and Departments, including the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the Office of Personnel Management, the Peace Corps, and the Departments of State, Transportation, Education, and Justice.

"This group of talented men and women will provide solid support for our Cabinet Secretaries and agency heads who have taken on the challenge of making our Federal Government work better for the American people," the President said.

### **National Aeronautics and Space Administration**

Alan Ladwig, Senior Policy Analyst, NASA

### **Department of State**

Toni Grant Verstandig, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Near Eastern Affairs

### **Department of Transportation**

Eugene A. Conti, Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary, Budget and Programs

### **Environmental Protection Agency**

Felicia A. Marcus, Regional Administrator, Region IX

**Peace Corps**

Frederick M. O'Regan, Regional Director,  
Eurasia Middle East Region  
Margaret Goodman, Regional Director,  
Asia Pacific Region  
Victor C. Johnson, Regional Director,  
Inter-America Region  
John P. Hogan, Associate Director of  
International Operations, International  
Operations  
Judy Harrington, Associate Director for  
Volunteer Support, Volunteer Support

**U.S. International Development  
Cooperation Agency, Overseas Private  
Investment Corporation**

Charles D. Toy, Vice President/General  
Counsel

**Office of Personnel Management**

Valerie Lau, Director of Policy, Office of  
the Director  
Lorraine Pratte Lewis, General Counsel,  
Office of the General Counsel

**Department of Education**

Linda G. Roberts, Special Adviser on Edu-  
cation Technology, Office of the Deputy  
Secretary  
Jamienne S. Studley, Deputy General  
Counsel, Regulations and Legislation  
Service

**Department of Justice**

Diane P. Wood, Deputy Assistant Attorney  
General, Antitrust Division  
Lois J. Schiffer, Deputy Assistant Attorney  
General, Environment and Natural Re-  
sources  
John A. Rogovin, Deputy Assistant Attor-  
ney General, Civil Division  
Mark I. Levy, Deputy Assistant Attorney  
General, Civil Division  
Irvin B. Nathan, Principal Associate Dep-  
uty Attorney General  
Merrick B. Garland, Deputy Assistant At-  
torney General, Criminal Division  
Eva M. Plaza, Deputy Assistant Attorney  
General, Civil Division  
Nancy E. McFadden, Deputy Associate  
Attorney General, Office of the Associ-  
ate Attorney General

NOTE: Biographies of the appointees were made available by the Office of the Press Secretary. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

**The President's Radio Address**

*November 6, 1993*

Good morning. This week I spoke with American workers and farmers who are succeeding in our competitive global economy. On Thursday, I went to Lexington, Kentucky, and visited the Lexmark factory, where they make computers, printers, and keyboards for sale all over the world. Anybody who thinks our American workers can't compete and win should have gone there with me. Yesterday I spoke with farmers from Illinois, Missouri, Montana, and North Carolina. They produce corn, soybeans, timber, and wheat, and they raise cattle. Just like the workers in Lexington, these farmers are eager to export more products all across the world, including to our neighbors in Mexico. The folks I spoke with on Thursday and Friday understand what's at stake in the debate about the North American Free Trade Agreement, or NAFTA for short. For them the debate is simple; it's about paychecks, not politics.

In Lexington, I also met with workers from Monarch Tool and Manufacturing. Their sales in Mexico have grown dramatically over the last 3 years. Teddie Rae True, who works at Monarch, told me she supports NAFTA because, she said, "Without it, I might not have a job." A lot of what we do depends on foreign trade. Roberta Canady has worked at Lexmark for 16 years. She said she still wants more facts about NAFTA, but she knows that, and I quote her, "The bottom line is whether it will promote more jobs for the people of the United States." Let me assure Roberta Canady and all of you: NAFTA means more exports, and more exports means more jobs for Americans.

There's been so much fog surrounding this issue that it's time to shed some light. NAFTA is good for us because it will cut the tariffs on trade between the United States and Mexico. Tariffs are taxes that countries put on products from other coun-